Remarks

Applicants are concurrently filing a Request for a Continuing Prosecution Application herewith.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on January 23, 2002, May 24, 2002, and August 20, 2002, as evidenced by the initialed Forms PTO-1449.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18-28 are currently pending in the application. Claims 21-28 are added by this Preliminary Amendment. No new matter is included. Attached to this Preliminary Amendment is Appendix A, which represents the marked-up version of the amended claims. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the rejected claims are respectfully requested.

Provisional Rejection

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 13-16 and 18-20 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 09/384,371. Applicants will consider filing a terminal disclaimer upon the indication of allowable subject matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Martino *et al.* (5,548,507) in view of Powell (6,157,905). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 recite, inter alia, creating a character table bank having at least one row representing an entry for a predetermined character and a plurality of columns associated with a corresponding row, wherein each column is associated with a predetermined character set, among other things.

Martino et al. is deficient because it discloses a process that identifies the language or genre of a stored or transmitted document using a plurality of Word Frequency Tables (WFTs) (see the Abstract) and does not disclose creating a character table bank having at least one row representing an entry for a predetermined character and a plurality of columns associated with a corresponding row, wherein each column is associated with a predetermined character set. The Examiner further acknowledges that Martino et al. is deficient because it discloses that a message is evaluated by comparing the words received from the source with each word in the plurality of language Word Frequency Tables (see Martino et al., col. 7, lines 59-67 and page 3 of the November 5, 2002 Office Action), rather than comparing the characters of the message.

The Examiner relies on Powell for disclosing the feature of comparing each character of the message to an entry for each of the character sets of the character table bank (see the November 5, 2002 Office Action). Applicants respectfully submit that even if Powell discloses comparing characters of a message, as alleged by the Examiner, Powell is deficient because it fails to disclose creating a character table bank having at least one row representing an entry for a predetermined character and a plurality of columns associated with a corresponding row, wherein each column is associated with a predetermined character set. Rather, Powell discloses using statistical models of languages and character sets to emphasize character values that tend to distinguish between different languages and character sets, while at the same time minimizing the amount of space in the models dedicated to character values that do not tend to differentiate languages or character sets by use of specialized reductive mappings (see Powell, col. 2, lines 50-56). More particularly, Powell discloses assigning target values for source or byte values (see tables 1-4 and 7) to minimize the amount of space in the models dedicated to character values, but Powell does not disclose creating a character table bank having at least one row representing

an entry for a predetermined character and a plurality of columns associated with a corresponding row, wherein each column is associated with a predetermined character set. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Martino et al. and Powell are deficient, both alone and in combination.

In view of the foregoing differences between independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 and the cited art, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness under §103 based on Martino *et al.* in view of Powell. Thus, claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are believed to be allowable and claims 5, 10, 15, and 20 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Martino *et al.* (5,548,507) in view of Powell (6,157,905) as applied to claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 and further in view of Edberg (5,873,111). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the following basis.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18 and 19 depend from one of independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 and therefore include the recitations of these independent claims. The above deficiencies of Martino et al. and Powell are not overcome by Edberg, which discloses a system and method for organizing information to perform accurate and efficient collation for information such as languages of various nationalities and regions (see Edberg, the Abstract). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Martino et al., Powell, and Edberg are deficient, both alone and in combination. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of dependent claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18 and 19 is improper because the cited references fail to suggest or disclose the features of these claims.

New claims 21-28 depend from one of independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 and therefore include the recitations of these independent claims. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such disposition is hereby solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference or interview would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the undersigned attorney stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully petition for any extension of time that may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fees, except for the Issue Fee, is to be charged to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0311.

Respectfully submitted,

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY
and POPEO, P.C.

By _____
Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283

12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900
Reston, Virginia 20190
Telephone: (703) 464-4800
Telefax: (703) 464-4895

Dated: March 5, 2003

APPENDIX A

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

The claims are amended as follows:

1. (Twice Amended) A method of evaluating characters in a message, comprising the steps of:

creating a character table bank having at least one row representing an entry for a predetermined character and a plurality of columns associated with a corresponding row, wherein each column is associated with a predetermined character set;

~~(a)~~ accepting an input of the characters of the message; and

~~(b)~~ evaluating the message by ~~comparing~~ determining whether the characters of the message are supported by the~~to a~~ predetermined ~~set of candidate~~ character sets associated with the corresponding plurality of columns of the ~~to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message, wherein the comparing comprises the step of comparing each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a~~ character table bank.

3. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of ~~comparing~~ evaluating the message further~~each character~~ comprises: ~~the step of~~

encoding the predetermined character of the at least one row in a universal code format;

testing the characters of the message against the encoded predetermined character to determine a match; and

identifying the predetermined character sets that correspond to the encoded predetermined character of the at least one row as character sets that express the characters of the messageability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for that character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the candidate character sets contains that character.

4. (Amended) The method of claim 3, wherein the universal code format is Unicode.

5. (Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of (c) computing a total number of characters of the message that match matched to each of the candidate predetermined character sets.

6. (Twice Amended) A system for evaluating characters in a message, comprising:

a character table bank unit that is adapted to create a character table bank having at least one row representing an entry for a predetermined character and a plurality of columns associated with a corresponding row, wherein each column is associated with a predetermined character set;

an input interface that is adapted to accept an input of the characters of the message; and

a processor unit, connected to the input interface, the processor unit that is adapted to evaluating evaluate the message by comparing determining whether the characters of the message are supported by the to a predetermined set of candidate character sets associated with the corresponding plurality of columns of the to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message, wherein the processor unit compares each

~~character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a~~ character table bank.

8. (Twice Amended) The system of claim 6, ~~wherein the processor unit~~ further comprises:

an encoding unit that is adapted to encode the predetermined character of the at least one row in a universal code format;

a testing unit that is adapted to test the characters of the message against the encoded predetermined character to determine a match; and

an identifying unit that is adapted to identify the predetermined character sets that correspond to the encoded predetermined character of the at least one row as character sets that express the characters of the message~~tests the ability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for that character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the candidate character sets contains that character~~.

9. (Amended) The system of claim 8, wherein the universal code format is Unicode.

10. (Amended) The system of claim 6, wherein the processor unit is adapted to compute ~~computes~~ a total number of characters of the message that match ~~matched to each of~~ the ~~candidate~~ predetermined character sets.

11. (Twice Amended) A system for evaluating characters in a message, comprising:

character table bank creating means for creating a character table bank having at least one row representing an entry for a predetermined character and a plurality of columns associated with a corresponding row, wherein each column is associated with a predetermined character set;

input interface means to accept an input of the characters of the message; and

processor means~~, connected to the input interface means, the processor means~~for evaluating the message by ~~comparing~~ determining whether the characters of the message are supported by the ~~to a~~ predetermined ~~set of candidate~~ character sets associated with the corresponding plurality of columns of the character table bank~~ to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message, wherein the processor means compares each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a character table bank~~.

13. (Twice Amended) The system of claim 11, further comprising:

encoding means for encoding the predetermined character of the at least one row in a universal code format;

testing means for testing the characters of the message against the encoded predetermined character to determine a match; and

identifying means for identifying the predetermined character sets that correspond to the encoded predetermined character of the at least one row as character sets that express the characters of the message~~wherein the processor means tests the ability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for~~

~~that character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the candidate character sets contains that character~~.

14. (Amended) The system of claim 13, wherein the universal code format is Unicode.

15. (Amended) The system of claim 11, wherein the processor means computes a total number of characters of the message that match ~~matched to each of~~ the ~~candidate~~ predetermined character sets.

16. (Amended) A storage medium for storing machine readable code, the machine readable code being executable to evaluate characters in an electronic message according to the steps of:

creating a character table bank having at least one row representing an entry for a predetermined character and a plurality of columns associated with a corresponding row, wherein each column is associated with a predetermined character set;

~~(a)~~ accepting an input of the characters of the message; and

~~(b)~~ evaluating the message by ~~comparing~~ determining whether the characters of the message are supported by the ~~to a~~ predetermined ~~set of candidate~~ character sets associated with the corresponding plurality of columns of the character table bank~~to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message, wherein the comparing comprises the step of comparing each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a character table bank~~.

18. (Twice Amended) The storage medium of claim 16, wherein the step of ~~comparing~~ evaluating the message further ~~each character~~ comprises: ~~the step of~~

encoding the predetermined character of the at least one row in a universal code format;

testing the characters of the message against the encoded predetermined character to determine a match; and

identifying the predetermined character sets that correspond to the encoded predetermined character of the at least one row as character sets that express the characters of the message~~ability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for the character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the candidate character sets contains that character~~.

19. (Amended) The storage medium of claim 18, wherein the universal code format is Unicode.

20. (Amended) The storage medium of claim 16, ~~wherein the steps further comprise~~ further comprising the step of ~~(c)~~ computing a total number of characters of the message that match ~~matched to each of~~ the ~~candidate~~ predetermined character sets.

CLAIMS 21-28 ARE ADDED AS NEW CLAIMS.